ase 1:05-cv-11322-GAO	Document 1	Filed 06/23/2005
43C 1.00 0V 110ZZ 0/10	Doddinent	1 1100 00/20/2000

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

PRECEDENT Of 3 65 67	
AMOUNT \$ 250	
SUMMONS ISSUED Y-/	
LOCAL RULE 4.1	
WAIVER FORM	
MCF ISSUED	
BY DPTY. CLK.	
DATE 6 23-05	

CLARA CLEMENS	_)
Plaintiff)
)
V.)
)
MET LIFE DISABILITY)
Defendant)

O5 CV 1 1 3 2 2 GAO

JRY DEMAND

MAGISTRATE JUDGE Collings

COMPLAINT and JURY DEMAND

Nature of Action

Plaintiff brings this action under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("EISA"), 29 U.S.C. sections 1001 et seq. as amended, and further 29 U.S.0 section 1132 (a)(1)(B) to recover damages for defendant's breach of a long term disability policy purchased and provided as a benefit of the plaintiff's employment by her former employer.

Claims

- 1. Plaintiff, Clara Clemeno, is an individual residing at 130 George Street Medford, Massachusetts, 02155.
- 2. Defendant, MetLife Disability is a duly organized corporation with a usual place of the benefits office with a usual place of business in Lexington, Kentucky, 40511-4590, P.O. Box 14590.
- 3. The policyholder for the Long Term Disability claims for MetLife is the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Boston located at 2121 Commonwealth Avenue, Brighton, Massachusetts, 02135.
- 4. Ms. Clemeno stopped working as a school teacher at Pope John XXIII high school on June 14, 2002, with the advice of her doctor after seeking treatment for an osteomy preformed, and removed tendons on November 6, 2002.
- 5. She then filed a disability claim with a diagnosis of Post Tibial Dysfunction. It was then that Ms. Clemeno filed claim for benefits under the Roman Catholic Archdiocese Long Term Disability Plan, referred to as "the LTD Plan".

- 6. On June 13, 2002 Ms. Clemeno's disability benefits were approved. After a 90-day period of disability, her disability commenced on September 4, 2002. Her benefits were calculated as 60 percent of her basic monthly pre-disability salary, minus other income benefits. Her monthly salary was \$3, 222.42 prior to her disability, and now her gross total LTD benefit is \$1, 933. 45 (60%).
- 7. Although all of Ms. Clemeno's doctors continued to support her claim of total disability, the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Boston LTD Plan decided to terminate benefits based on the medical statements from Dr. Mattingly and Dr. Corbett.
- 8. By letter dated August 28, 2003 MetLife disability advised Ms. Clemeno that her benefits had been discontinued. In this letter, it was documented that a copy of the medical statements were insufficient to support the existence of a disability as defined by the Roman Catholic Archdioceses of Boston LTD Plan.
- 9. MetLife cited that Dr. Mattingly does not provide medically documented findings to reflect physical examination or treatment being provided. In addition, the medical documentation from Dr. Corbett does not indicate that Ms. Clemeno has experienced any post surgical complications or that the physical therapy has failed to return physical conditions that were experienced to prior state of functionality.
- 10. After receiving the notice of termination of benefits, Ms. Clemeno appealed and provided additional information to MetLife including an April 16, 2003 Physical Therapy note, April 29, 2003 letters from Dr. Pastan, Dr. Mattingly's office notes of April 9, 2003 and August 8, 2003 and a note dated from him September 22, 2003.
- 11. MetLife reviews Ms. Clemeno's file in entirety and identified key elements lacking from the documentation was a detailed description of functional abilities for standing and walking, evidence of swelling or synovitis to the knees, ankles or hips after standing for prolonged periods of time, physical exam findings for decreased range of motion to your hips, knees, and ankles, description of gait and deed for assistive device for ambulation. There was no testing submitted to determine extent of current findings of the right hip, no indications that severe unrelenting pain is present, or indication that additional therapy was prescribed to increase functional abilities.
- 12. By letter, dated October 15, 2003, informed Ms.Clemeno that they were upholding their decision to terminate her benefits and that she had exhausted her right to administrative remedies under the plan and no further appeals will be considered. This termination was in bad faith, unreasonable, not supported by substantial evidence, and a breach of the terms of Ms. Clemeno's disability policy.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- That the Court enter judgment against the defendant awarding the plaintiff retroactive and present disability benefits together with prejudgment interest, or an amount deemed just by this Court of law;
- That the Court award-plaintiff her-attorneys' fees, court-costs and all other reasonable costs incurred; and
- 3. That the Court grants such other and further relief as it may deem just and proper.

PLAINTIFF HEREBY REQUESTS A TRIAL BY JURY.

Respectfully submitted For The Plaintiff, Mary Giorgio By her attorney

LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL F. WALSH, P.C.

Michael F. Walsh

1200 East Street

Westwood, MA 02090

(781) 251-0100 BBO# 550658

Dated:June 6, 2005

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

1. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS					
(b) County of Residence of	George Street, Medford, MA 02155 First Listed Plaintiff Middlesex (CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		MetLife Disability, P.O. Box 14590, Lexington, KY 40511 County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Suffolk (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: INLAND CONDEMNATION CASES. USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED,				
Michael F. Walsh, Law Offices of Michae	, Address, and Telephone Number) \$60 [#] 55065 1 F. Walsh, PC, 1200 East Street, West -251-0100		Attorneys (If Kno	*	22 GAO		
11. BASIS OF JURISDI 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff 2 U.S. Government Defendant	CTION (Place an "Y' in One Box Only) ■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) □ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	(For Div Citizen o Citizen o	versity Cases Only)	TF DEF	This State Principal Place 5 5		
IV. NATURE OF SUI CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller-Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY 2 1 0 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	TORTS PERSONAL INJURY 3 10 Airplane 362 Personal Injury 365 Personal Injury 365 Personal Injury 365 Personal Injury 366 Personal Injury 367 Personal 370 Other Personal 365 Property Damage 365 Property Damage 366 Other Personal Injury 366 Other Personal 370 Other P	FORFE 1	Agriculture Other Food & Drug Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 Liquor Laws R.R. & Truck Airline Regs. Occupational Safety /Health Other LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act Labor Mgmt. Relations Labor Mgmt Reporting & Disclosure Act Railway Labor Act Other Labor Litigation Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 810 Patent 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 961 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC DIWW(405(g)) 865 RS1 (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 8-10 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 8-1 IRS-Third Pam 26 USC 7,609	OTHER STATUTES 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce ICC Rates etc. 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 810 Selective Service 850 Securities Commodities Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 U.S.C. 3410 891 Agricultural Act, 892 Economic Stabilization Act 891 Environmental Metters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900. Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 890 Other Statutory Action,		
V. ORIGIN Proceeding VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Plaintiff brings this action under trecover damages for defendant's by VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CA IF ANY	ate Court Appellate Court (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (breach of a long term disability policy purchased and produced in the Check IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 SE(S) (See INSTRUCTIONS and LR 3.1 (e)) JUDGE SIGNATURE OF ATTERIORS	Reopene and write brief ("ERISA"), 29 ovided as a ben DEMA	another another of specify of statement of case. U.S.C. sections 1001 of the plaintiff's effective of	Litigation et seq. as amended, and further 29 imployment by her former employ	Judgment P U.S.0 section 1132 (a)(1)(B) to		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	2.005 MOUN APPLYING IFP	_fh	JUDGE /	The MAG, JUDI	GE		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

1.	Title of	case (nam	ne of first party on ea	ch side only)_	Clara Clum	ent	v. M	etlil	e VISO	DITUTAL
2.	•	Category in which the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of suit code listed on the civil cover sheet. (See local rule 40.1(a)(1)).								
	—	l.	160, 410, 470, 535,	R.23, REGARD	LESS OF NATURE OF	SUIT.				
•	¥.	11.			40, 550, 555, 625, 710, 0, 890, 892-894, 895, 95				AO 120 or AC lemark or cop	
		III.			230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371,					
	_	IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 690, 810, 861-865, 8		_					
	_	V.	150, 152, 153.			. هم			22	GAC
3.					rule 40.1(g)). If more to est filed case in this co		e prior re	elated cas	e has been fil	ed in this
4.	Has a p	rior actio	n between the same p	parties and ba	sed on the same claim		en filed i	n this co	urt?	
						YES	Ц	NO	Ц	
5.	Does th	•	int in this case quest	ion the constit	utionality of an act of o	congre	s affectir	ng the pu	blic interest?	(See 28
	lfen is	the U.S.4	A. or an officer, agent	or employee c	of the IIS a narty?	YES	Ш	NO	Li	
	50, 15	110 0.0.5	a. or all officer, agent	or employee e	r aro oro. a party r	YES		NO		
6.	is this o	case requ	ired to be heard and	determined by	a district court of three	e iudae	s pursuai	nt to title	28 USC §2284	?
•		- a - c - q - c - q - c				YES		NO		•
7.	_	•	· ·	* *	nmental agencies of the g in Massachusetts res					
						YES		NO		
		Α.	If yes, in which div	risìon do <u>all</u> of	the non-governmental	parties	reside?			
			Eastern Division		Central Division			West	ern Division	
		В.	lf no, in which divi agencies, residing		ajority of the plaintiffs of setts reside?	or the o	nly partie	s, exclud	ling governme	ental
			Eastern Division		Central Division			West	tern Division	
8.			of Removal - are ther te sheet identifying th		pending in the state co	ourt red	uiring th	e attentio	on of this Cou	t? (If yes,
	o contint	_ copula	to choos recording to	monoria;		YES		NO		
•		YPE OR I	نامه ما من ۱۸۸	E HAICE						
		aman s'Y j-6		F. Walsh	UDOD MA, 07	a ha	<u> </u>			
	DRESS			1. 257.	_ (2040				
ΙĖ	LEPHON	KE NU	LIGHT ! IT ()	11.021						